# Montana Tech Faculty Senate Meeting
## Friday February 3rd, 2017
## Pinter Room - noon-1:30pm

**Attendance**

**Senators present:** Abhishek Choudhury, Glen Southergill, Tony Patrick, Vicki Petritz, Dan Autenrieth, Bill Drury, Miriam Young, Scott Risser, Atish Mitra, Charie Faught, Michael Webb, Conor Cote, Brian Kukay

**Guests:** Carrie Vath, Doug Abbott

**Welcome & Minutes**

I.   Welcome and Minutes
   a.   Found online at http://www.mtech.edu/about/facultysenate/minutes/index.htm
   b.   *Motion to approve. Passed.*

**Action Items**

II.   Proposed Academic Honesty Policy –Guest Dr. Carrie Vath
   a.   The proposed revision to the Academic Honesty Policy written by the workgroup appointed by the Senate was reviewed for Senate approval
   b.   Charie Faught said the workgroup did a great job pulling together different responded to specific questions and feedback submitted by Faculty,
   c.   Discussion – Carrie Vath went through the feedback submitted to the workgroup and the committee's response to each piece of feedback. Items that generated discussion are noted below:
       i.   Under **Faculty, Staff, and Administrator Responsibility**: "It is the duty of Faculty, Staff and Administrators to take reasonable precautions to prevent and discourage academic dishonesty."
       ii.   What are "reasonable precautions"? Carrie Vath provided suggested precautions from other institutions for preventing academic dishonesty, such as adding an integrity statement, linking to the policy in syllabi, signing an honor pledge, having students sign the first page of a test, teaching academic integrity as a part of course, creating a healthy testing environment, etc. Suggested that the Senate could develop its own list of suggestions for Faculty.
       iii.   Glen Southergill said he would prefer to replace "it is the duty of" with "are encouraged"; this encourages the behavior but doesn't take the responsibility off of the student.
       iv.   Miriam Young said that in the past when this is come up, legal counsel has found that the instructor does have an obligation to take reasonable precaution, such as establishing an appropriate testing environment.
       v.   Carrie Vath said that if there are legal obligations then the language "it is a duty" makes sense and is helpful to the instructor.
       vi.   Charie Faught asked about how this issue relates to accreditation requirements?
       vii.   Doug Abbott said the accreditor is not prescriptive on this matter.
       viii.   Carrie Vath said that looking at other policies, most included language such as "it is the 'duty 'or 'responsibility' of…" If approved by the Senate, the next step for the policy will be legal counsel before it is approved by the Full Faculty.

    ix. Bill Drury said that is should be clear that nothing in the policy relieves the student's responsibility not to cheat. Students should not be able to use this as an excuse. Doug Abbott suggested "shared responsibility" might be appropriate language.

- **Motion:** Change language to "It is the **shared responsibility** of Faculty, Staff, and Administrators **to attempt to take** reasonable precautions." *Motion passed.*

    x. Discussion of the language "Additionally, it is a duty of Faculty, Staff and Administrators to report instances of academic dishonesty to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs through the online reporting form." There was some discussion on the difference between an instance and a charge. An instance might be worked out between the Faculty member and instructor, a charge is a formal accusation of cheating.

- **Motion**: Change language to "Additionally, it is a duty of Faculty, Staff and Administrators to report ~~instances~~ **charges** of academic dishonesty to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs through the online reporting form." *Motion Passed.*

    xi. Under **Cheating – Taking Information** "5. Accessing another student's electronic device (e.g. cell phone, tablet, laptop, desktop, etc.) and taking information from the device."

    xii. Discussion about whether this would include a student signing into another student's computer or online course account. Carrie Vath suggested this behavior would fall under the campus' acceptable computer use policy as well as the statement "6. Allowing another person to complete assignments for an online course."

    xiii. Discussion about whether this statement should include "without consent" at the end. The implication being that a student may use another student's electronic device to take information willingly and without violating policy (such as working as part of a group project).

- **Motion:** Change language to "5. Accessing another student's electronic device (e.g. cell phone, tablet, laptop, desktop, etc.) and taking information from the **device without consent**. *Motion passed.*

    xiv. Under **Policy on Cheating**: "The instructor shall contact the student with evidence of the cheating in writing within one week of discovery of the event."

    xv. Some discussion on this timeline and if a set time period is appropriate. What if the cheating is discovered over the break? Carrie Vath explained this situation would be taken into account.

- **Motion:** To approve the revised Academic Honesty Policy with the minor edits described above. *Motion passed.*

III. Resolution – Workgroup charged with program prioritization and Special Focus status leadership

    a. Proposed Resolution from Faculty Senate officers

        i. The Faculty Senate officers provided the Senate with a proposal to form a workgroup to address program prioritization and the Special Focus status.

        ii. The workgroup would be expected to meet with all academic entities to solicit feedback. The proposal recommends one faculty member from each college, and for the Senate to also solicit members from the Staff Senate and MBMG.

iii. The Faculty Senate expects the representatives on this committee to regular solicit input from all campus stakeholders.  Is this clear from the proposal?
- **Motion:** Add sentence at end of the resolution's first paragraph "The committee will be expected to obtain regular feedback from all campus constituencies." *Motion passed.*

iv. Scott Risser suggested that each college be asked to submit nominations and send them to the Senate Chair and Secretary. The Senate will compile these nominations, and then put the nominations to a vote.

v. Discussion of workgroup as an "academic advisory committee" as described in proposal. If this committee will be reviewing all programs both academic and non-academic, is that language appropriate? Suggestion by Bill Drury to remove "academic".
- **Motion:**  Change resolution language to "The Faculty Senate resolves to charter an ~~academic~~ advisory committee…" *Motion passed.*

vi. Some discussion of the timeline for this process. Doug Abbott noted that Boise State took two years – 1 year for recommendations, and another to enact them.

vii. Vicki Petritz asked about the procedural steps for the resolution. How would nomination and confirmation take place?

viii. Abhishek Choudhury suggested that faculty from each college nominate for their college. Some discussion about who should facilitate voting. Suggestion that Senators from each college facilitate voting, essentially using the same nomination method as is used for the Rose and Anna Busch Awards.

ix. Glen Southergill reiterated that this will be a big commitment, is a very important role.

x. Brian Kukay suggested that an alternate be chosen. The person that gets second highest votes would serve as backup.

xi. Abhishek Choudhury suggested that the description of the role of the committee is somewhat vague. Can we come up with a more clear description of what they will be getting into?

xii. Glen Southergill suggested the officers could work on a more detailed job description for Workgroup members.
- Abhishek Choudhury – **Motion:** To accept the resolution with the minor edits described above. *Motion passed.*

xiii. Officers will work on a job description for workgroup members and bring that back to the Senate.

**Discussion Items**

IV. Other Items
a. Question about course modifications that have been approved by the Curriculum Review Committee or General Education Committee. Who submits the approved changes? Changes are submitted to the registrar by the chair of each committee. However it is good practice to make sure that the change actually makes it to the catalog the following semester.
b. Next Senate meeting will be Friday. February 17th.
c. Agenda items:
   i. Changes to Faculty/Staff handbook

    ii. Discussion of the UM policy on granting student requests with Limited English Proficiency ([http://www.umt.edu/eo/equalop/lepqa.php](http://www.umt.edu/eo/equalop/lepqa.php))

V. Meeting adjourned.